

Coram: R.R. Jain, J.

February 16, 1996.

Oral order:

Heard Mr. P.V. Hathi, learned advocate for the petitioner.

This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India challenging Syndicate Election of Saurashtra University, held on 10.4.1994 contending that the election was conducted illegally, arbitrarily and in violation of recognised norms of election. Mr. Hathi has alleged violation of statute framed under Section 65 (2) of the Saurashtra University Act, 1965. Statute No.80 (2) is reproduced on page 4 of the petition. But, Mr. Hathi has not been able to satisfy as to how this provision has been violated. In absence of any specific instance as regards violation, I do not find any force in this submission.

Second contention that the allegation was conducted illegally, arbitrarily and in violation of recognised norms of election also does not find favour since the petitioner has not made any reference to particular incident. As a cardinal rule, in case of matters challenging elections, the petitioner has to be precise and specific about the allegations and the same has to be supported by cogent evidence. Except bare allegations, I do not find any specific and particular instance tantamount to illegality or giving complete go-by to the recognised norms of election.

The last contention is that some names in the voters list has been surreptitiously added with a view to favour some candidates and that the said list was not circulated to all the candidates. The alleged list of additional voters has been placed at Annexure C. This clearly shows that it is an addition to one which was circulated alongwith notice of Election dated 15.3.1994 and, therefore, this contention is also devoid of merit.

In view of the aforesaid observation, I do not find any substance and hence the petition is rejected.

16.2.1996. (R. R. Jain, J.)

